Cellulose, Cellulose Benzoate and Cellulose Citrate from Screw Pine (*Pandanus tectorius*) Leaves as PVDF Filler for Improved Permeability and Anti-fouling Properties
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Abstract

Cellulose was isolated from screw pine (*Pandanus tectorius*) leaves through an alkalization and bleaching process and synthesized into cellulose benzoate and cellulose citrate. Cellulose, cellulose benzoate, and cellulose citrate were introduced to polyvinylidene fluoride (PVDF) matrix as fillers via blending-phase inversion method to improve PVDF membrane permeability and anti-fouling properties. The effect of cellulose, cellulose benzoate, and cellulose citrate fillers on PVDF membrane hydrophilicity, permeability, selectivity, anti-fouling properties, and morphology was investigated. The result demonstrates that the PVDF membrane’s hydrophilicity, permeability, and anti-fouling properties were improved by the addition of filler. With the addition of 0.3% of cellulose, cellulose citrate, and cellulose benzoate, water permeability in PVDF was doubled. PVDF membrane rejection of methylene blue increased up to 86, 85 and 82%, respectively, with the addition of 0.3% cellulose, cellulose citrate, and cellulose benzoate. Anti-fouling properties value increased up to 89% in 0.3% cellulose citrate addition. These results indicated that cellulose, cellulose benzoate, and cellulose citrate from screw pine leaves are excellent for PVDF membrane fillers which are comparable with other reported membranes.
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1 Introduction

Polyvinylidene fluoride (PVDF) is a semi-crystalline polymer with a crystalline and amorphous phase. PVDF is the material used in membrane the most due to its high mechanical strength, thermal stability, chemical resistance, and simplicity of fabrication [1]. Membrane is typically favored because of its inherent benefits, including its low cost, ease of use, high recovery rate, high level of selectivity, low pollution, and ability to work in conjunction with other wastewater treatment methods [2–4]. PVDF membrane has been widely used in water treatment, microfiltration, ultrafiltration, and distillation [5]. However, PVDF membrane has limitation due to their hydrophobic properties that reduce membrane performances such as water permeability, rejection, and fouling resistance [2]. Hence, hydrophilic modification is proposed to increase PVDF membrane performances and lifetimes that have growing interest in recent years membrane technology [6, 7].

The performance of the membrane is enhanced by raising its hydrophilicity. Several techniques are utilized to enhance membrane performance, including surface grafting or coating, chemical modification, and mixing alteration. Modification by blending with hydrophilic polymers, such as cellulose and its derivatives, is the easiest and most widely used strategy to alter membrane structure [5, 6]. Cellulose has a large specific surface area, low density, and high porosity which is made up of anhydroglucose units connected by β-1,4-glycosidic bonds [8, 9]. Cellulose has been isolated from a variety of plant parts, such as cocoa pod husk [10], banana stem [11], groundnut shells [12], sugarcane bagasse [13], coccinia grandis stem [14] and screw pine leaves (*Pandanus tectorius*) [15, 16]. There has been relatively little research carried out on cellulose of screw pine leaves. Screw pine leaves contains 37.30% cellulose, 34.40% hemicellulose, 24.00% lignin, and 2.5% extractive content [16]. Screw pine leaves are widely used for making rope, weddings, basket, chairs, weaving hats and mats [15, 16].

Three hydroxyl groups of cellulose can be modified by adding specific functional groups for obtaining cellulose
derivatives. Modification of cellulose can improve its properties which increases the variety of uses for it in areas including biomedicine, agriculture, water purification and food industry [8]. Cellulose esters have many advantages such as biodegradable, low-cost, non-toxic, and heat resistant [17, 18]. The use of cellulose and cellulose acetate in membrane technology has increased recently [7, 19–21]. Adding cellulose to PVDF matrix can enhance the hydrophilicity and anti-fouling qualities of the membrane. Addition 0.5 and 1% cellulose improve hydrophilicity, water permeability, rejection, and Flux Recovery Ratio (FRR) value of PVDF membrane [21]. In membrane technology, cellulose acetate (CA) is frequently utilized as matrix membranes or PVDF membrane filler [19, 22–25].

Other cellulose derivatives, such as cellulose benzoate (CB) and cellulose citrate (CC) have been studied. CB is most frequently employed in separation enantiomer [26, 27], while CC is widely used in adsorption fields and bio-composite materials [28–30]. CB and CC have never been applied as fillers in PVDF membranes. CB and CC are expected to have better properties than that of CA for improving PVDF membrane performances, because their structure has hydrophilic groups that can increase hydrophilicity, thereby increasing the permeability and anti-fouling properties of PVDF membranes.

The aim of this study was to evaluate the effect of CB, CC and screw pine leave cellulose as PVDF membrane filler which was fabricated by phase inversion method and followed by assessing membrane performances on hydrophilicity, water permeability, selectivity, anti-fouling properties, and morphology. In this work, cellulose was isolated from screw pine leaves and synthesized into CB and CC by esterification.

2 Materials and methods
2.1 Materials
Screw pine leaves (SP) was collected from Yogyakarta coastal area, Indonesia. Natrium hydroxide, natrium hypochlorite, pyridine, benzoyl chloride, citric acid, dimethylacetamide, polyethylene glycol (PEG) Mw 400 Da as pore-former were purchased from E-merck. Poly(vinylidene Fluoride) (Solef PVDF 1010 Mw 352 kDa) was obtained from Solvay.

2.2 Instrumentations
FTIR analysis was carried out on an IR Prestige-21 SHIMADZU spectroscopy. TGA analysis was conducted by Linseis PT – 1600 thermogravimetric analyzer. SEM analysis of membranes were performed using JEOL Benchtop JCM 7000. ATR-FTIR was analyzed by Carry 630 Agilent in the range 650–4000 cm⁻¹.

2.3 Methods
2.3.1 Isolation of cellulose
Preparation and isolation cellulose from SP refer to [16] and [31]. SP were washed with water and dried sun. Dried SP were grounded and sieved. SP powder was added NaOH 10% (1:20, w/v), stirred at 80 °C for 2 h, and then neutralized with water. The slurry was added NaOCl 4% (1:20, w/v) pH 4.5, stirred at 80 °C for 2 h. The mixture was neutralization with water and dried to obtain screw pine leaves cellulose (SPC) which was analyzed by fourier-transform infrared spectroscopy (FT-IR) and thermogravimetric analysis (TGA).

2.3.2 Synthesis of cellulose benzoate and cellulose citrate
Cellulose benzoate was synthesized following Zhang et al. method [32]. SPC (0.5 g) was added with 25 mL pyridine and stirred at 40 °C for 30 mins. Then, the mixture was added with 10 mL benzoyl chloride and stirred at 50 °C for 3 h. At last, acetone was added to the mixture, stirred for 1 h, and then filtered. The precipitation was washed with water and dried to obtain cellulose benzoate (SPCB).

Cellulose citrate was synthesized following to Solo et al. method [33]. Firstly, a citric acid solution was obtained by dissolving of 3.5 g citric acid in 5 mL distilled water. Citric acid solution was then added 0.5 g SPC, stirred for 2 h and transferred to an evaporating dish. The mixture was put in the oven at 50 °C for 24 h and further heated 90 °C for 90 mins, then leaved to cool. Secondly, the slurry was added with 10 mL distilled water, stirred for 1 h. The solution is neutralized and dried to obtain cellulose citrate (SPCC). The synthesized cellulose benzoate and cellulose citrate were analyzed by FTIR and TGA.

2.3.3 Fabrication of PVDF/SPC, PVDF/SPCB, and PVDF/SPCC Membranes
PVDF/SPC, PVDF/SPCB, and PVDF/SPCC membranes were fabricated using phase inversion method [21]. Dope solution was produced using blending method. Firstly, dimethylacetamide (DMAc) and PEG 400 were stirred for 5 mins. The mixture was added with filler (SPC, SPCC) and stirred for 10 mins. PVDF was added last and the dope solution was stirred for 24 h at 60 °C. The dope solution was cast in a glass plate and immersed in coagulant
bath containing distilled water. The formed membrane was stored in glycerin for further analysis. The scheme of fabrication membranes was shown in Fig. 1.

Membranes from glycerin storage was washed with distilled water before analysis. Top surface and cross-section of membrane were analyzed using scanning electron microscope (SEM). Attenuated total reflection–Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy (ATR–FTIR) was used to analyze functional groups in membrane surface. Thermal stability of membrane was analyzed by TGA. PVDF membrane was modified with filler (SPC, SPCB and SPCC). The composition of filler in the dope solution was shown in Table 1.

2.3.4 Analysis of PVDF/SPC, PVDF/SPCB, and PVDF/SPCC membrane performance

Membrane performance analysis was evaluated by water permeability from pure water flux (PWF) and water flux, rejection, and FRR which was continuously measured using dead-end system. PWF was measurement carried out by placed membrane with 5 cm diameter in a stirred cell and filled with distilled water. The diameter is used to calculate the surface area of membrane ($A$). Rejection and water flux test were conducted with replaced the distilled water with 100 ppm methylene blue (MB) solution. FRR test was carried out by replacing the MB solution with a small amount of distilled water to wash the surface membrane, then was filled with new distilled water. System compaction was performed at 2 bars for 15 mins before every measurement. The amount of permeate volume ($v$) was collected and the operating time used ($t$) was calculated.

2.4 Characterization procedures

Samples were analyzed with KBr plate in the range 500–4000 cm$^{-1}$. Samples for TGA analysis were heated from 30 to 900 °C with a heating rate 10 °C per min at atmospheric conditions. Membranes were broken in liquid nitrogen and gold coated for 5 min before SEM analysis. ATR–FTIR in the range 650–4000 cm$^{-1}$.

Cellulose chain has three OH groups per anhydroglucose (AGU) unit [34]. The percentage of OH groups can be determined from the degree of substitution (DS) per AGU after the esterification process on cellulose benzoate and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membranes</th>
<th>PVDF (%)</th>
<th>PEG 400 (%)</th>
<th>DMAc (%)</th>
<th>SPC (%)</th>
<th>SPCB (%)</th>
<th>SPCC (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>78.00</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMC0.1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>77.90</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMC0.3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>77.70</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMC0.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>77.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMC1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>77.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMC1.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>76.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMCB0.3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>77.70</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMCC0.3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>77.70</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1 Scheme of fabrication membranes
cellulose citrate. DS can be calculated using absorbance (Abs) C=O esters at ~1730 cm\(^{-1}\) and Abs C-O cellulose at ~1060 cm\(^{-1}\) in Eq. (1) [35]:

\[
DS = \frac{\text{Abs}_{\text{C-O esters}}}{\text{Abs}_{\text{C-O cellulose}}}.
\]  

Membrane characterization was determined by water contact angle, porosity, average pore size, and beta fraction. Membrane porosity (\(\varepsilon\)) and average pore size (\(r\)) were evaluated using gravimetric method and Guerout–Elford–Ferry equation, respectively [24]. The wet (\(W_{\text{wet}}\)) and dried (\(W_{\text{dried}}\)) membranes which were heated at 60 °C for 24 h were weighed. The thickness of wet membranes (\(l_{\text{wet}}\)) was measured and is water density (g cm\(^{-3}\)). Membrane porosity is calculated by Eq. (2) and membrane average pore size is measured by Eq. (3):

\[
\varepsilon(\%) = \left(\frac{W_{\text{wet}} - W_{\text{dried}}}{A \times l_{\text{wet}} \times \rho}\right),
\]

\[
r = \sqrt{\frac{(2.9 - 1.75\varepsilon) \times \eta l_{\text{wet}}}{3800 \times \varepsilon \times \Delta P}},
\]

where \(\varepsilon\) is the porosity (%), \(\Delta P\) is pressure (Pa), \(\eta\) is viscosity of water at 25 °C (8.9 × 10\(^{-4}\) Pa s), \(l_{\text{wet}}\) is wet thickness of the membrane (m), \(A\) is the membrane area (m\(^2\)) and \(J_{\text{i}}\) is pure water flux (PWF) (L m\(^{-2}\) h\(^{-1}\)). The value of PWF (\(J_{\text{i}}\)) and water flux (\(J_{\text{2}}\)) is determined by Eq. (4), rejection value (\(R\)) is determined by Eq. (5) which concentration of permeate (\(C_{\text{p}}\)) and retentate (\(C_{\text{r}}\)) were measured by UV-Vis spectroscopy (HITACHI UH5300) at 664 nm, and FRR value is determined by Eq. (6) [6]:

\[
J_{\text{i}} = \frac{v}{A \times t}.
\]

\[
\%R = \left(1 - \frac{C_{\text{p}}}{C_{\text{r}}}\right) \times 100\%.
\]

\[
\text{FRR} = \frac{J_{\text{2}}}{J_{\text{i}}} \times 100\%.
\]

3 Results and discussion

3.1 Synthesis of cellulose benzoate and cellulose citrate

FT-IR spectra and thermogram of cellulose correspond with the previous study [16]. Removal of hemicellulose and lignin from cellulose was confirmed by the absence of the carbonyl group in the SPC FTIR spectra. SPC is used as a starting material for synthesizing of SPCB and SPCC. FT-IR spectra and thermogram of SPC, SPCB, and SPCC are shown in Fig. 2.

FT-IR spectra of SPCB in Fig. 2 (a) shows new peaks at 3065 cm\(^{-1}\) for C-H of benzene ring, 1729 cm\(^{-1}\) for C=O ester, 1601 cm\(^{-1}\), and 1451 cm\(^{-1}\) for C=C benzene ring, 1270 cm\(^{-1}\) for C-O carboxylate, and 709 cm\(^{-1}\) for monosubstituted C-H benzene group. Benzoylation process decreased a peak at 3416 cm\(^{-1}\), indicating substitution of hydroxyl groups [27, 32]. SPCC spectra showed appearance of a new peak at 1730 cm\(^{-1}\) for C=O carbonyl ester and decreasing a peak intensity of 3411 cm\(^{-1}\), indicating substitution hydroxyl group with citrate functional group [30, 36]. The FTIR spectra confirmed that SPCB and SPCC were successfully synthesized by non-Fischer reaction. The DS value of cellulose benzoate is 0.1 and cellulose citrate is 0.2. Thus the OH group substituted on cellulose benzoate is 3.33% and cellulose citrate is 6.67% per AGU. Whereas, the OH group present on cellulose benzoate is 96.67% and cellulose citrate is 106.67%, because every 1 g/mol of citric acid has three OH groups.

![Fig 2 FTIR spectra (a) and thermogram (b) of SPC, SPCB, and SPCC](image)
Thermal stability of SPC was improved by the esterification process (Fig. 2 (b)), where higher degradation temperatures of SPCB and SPCC were occurred [37]. Because a large amount of water in SPC is bounded by hydroxyl groups, weight decrease was greater at the early stage of degradation [38]. Degradation of the SPCC polymer chain was occurred at second stage, and the decarbonization stage form CO$_2$ gas was took place at third stage [13, 39]. SPC, SPCB, and SPCC have thermal stability at the second stage of 200, 270, and 250 $^\circ$C, respectively. Higher thermal stability of SPCB and SPCC than SPC due to substitution of hydroxyl groups with C=O carbonyl ester groups.

3.2 PVDF/SPC membrane

For initial study, PVDF/SPC membranes were fabricated using variation concentration of SPC as shown in Table 1. Membrane performances were investigated for porosity and average pore size (Fig. 3 (a)). PMC0.3 membrane shows the highest value of porosity and average pore size since hydroxyl groups of cellulose enhanced the diffusional exchange rate of solvent and non-solvent, resulting in large pores [40]. The water contact angle was measured to determine the membrane surface hydrophilicity. The water contact angle of PVDF/SPC membranes decreased with the increase of cellulose addition (Fig. 3 (b)). During phase inversion process, cellulose migrated to membrane surface due to its high affinity with water, then generated smooth skin layer which can improve hydrophilicity of PVDF/cellulose membranes [41]. The highest standard deviation (SD) obtained for all parameters examined was 4.82 in PMC0.3, indicating strong homogeneity (SD < 5%). Cellulose addition increased average pore size and lowered water contact angle significantly (p < 0.05) but raised PVDF membrane porosity insignificantly (p > 0.05).

All PVDF/SPC membranes, excluded PMC0.1, gave increasing pure water flux (PWF) value after the addition of cellulose (Fig. 4 (a)). When 0.3% w/w cellulose was added to the PVDF membrane, the double PWF value increased from 17.08 to 36.85 L m$^{-2}$ h$^{-1}$. Increased hydrophilicity and improved pore size, which allow water molecules to move across membranes with ease, were credited with increasing PWF value [2, 42, 43]. In this study, adding 0.3% w/w of cellulose generated membrane with the highest pure water flux, porosity and pore size. The membrane with the smallest pore size was PMC0.1 which has the lowest PWF value. Upon addition up to 0.3% w/w of cellulose, MB rejection and water flux of the membranes declined, while increasing amount of cellulose addition resulted in decreasing MB rejection and water flux of the membranes (Fig. 4 (b)). The rejection value of the PVDF membrane increased from 82.89% to 86.50%, due to the hydrogen bond formed by hydroxyl group of the surface membrane and $\text{−NH}_2$ group of the MB [44]. The PVDF membrane's water flux value increased doubled, from 11.22 to 23.49 L m$^{-2}$ h$^{-1}$. Water could pass through the membrane more quickly with 0.3% w/w cellulose added due to its high porosity and pore size [45]. Water flux was reduced by the addition of more than 0.3% w/w of cellulose because porosity and pore size decreased [46].

The highest FRR value of 88.29% was obtained for PMC 1.5 (Fig. 4 (c)), which is the greatest hydrophilic membrane. Because hydroxyl groups of cellulose created a hydration layer on the surface of the membrane and reduced dye blocking and hydrophobic interactions between membrane and MB [47]. FRR of PMC0.3 and PMC0.5 decreased from 80.26% to 74.96% and 76.38%, respectively. Poor dispersion of filler particles [48], large porosity and pore size of PMC0.3 and PMC0.5 resulted pore blocking by MB molecules which could not be removed by washing treatment [40]. The largest standard deviation (SD) recorded

![Fig. 3 Porosity and average pore size (a), water contact angle (b) of PVDF and PVDF/SPC membranes](image-url)
for all parameters examined was 4.93 in PMC1, indicating excellent homogeneity (SD < 5%). Cellulose addition significantly improved all PVDF membrane performances, such as PWF, water flux, rejection, and FRR (p < 0.05). Due to its superior performance compared to other membranes, PMC0.3 was further examined using SEM, ATR-FTIR, and TGA. Furthermore, 0.3% w/w addition of SPCB and SPCC were applied for PVDF membranes.

3.3 PVDF/SPCB and PVDF/SPCC

The PVDF/SPCB and PVDF/SPCC membranes have increased porosity and average pore size as a result of adding hydrophilic SPCB and SPCC (0.3% w/w) into PVDF matrix (Fig. 5 (a)). Presence of SPCB and SPCC accelerates the exchange rate between the solvent and non-solvent in phase inversion [7, 49]. With the addition of 0.3% w/w SPC, SPCB, and SPCC, the water contact angle of all fabricated PVDF membrane lowered (Fig. 5 (b)), indicating an increase in membrane hydrophilicity.

The PMCC0.3 membrane has the lowest water contact angle (75.5°), which potentially has better anti-fouling resistance [21]. The highest standard deviation (SD) obtained for all parameters examined was 4.82 in PMCO.3, indicating strong homogeneity (SD < 5%). The addition of all fillers significantly enhanced the PVDF membrane’s porosity, average pore size, and water contact angle (p < 0.05).

PWF values of all modified PVDF membranes increased with addition of SPC, SPCB, and SPCC (Fig. 6 (a)). The increased PWF value was in line with the increased porosity, where PMCB0.3 had the highest PWF value of...
44.38 L m\(^{-2}\) h\(^{-1}\). Interconnectivity of membrane pores resulted in highest PWF value, where water easily passed through the membrane [50, 51].

Water flux also affected water permeability. With the addition of fillers, the water flux values of PMC0.3, PMCB0.3, and PMCC0.3 increased (Fig. 6 (b)). PMCB0.3 membrane had the highest water flux value of 46.82 L m\(^{-2}\) h\(^{-1}\). Water easily passes through the membrane as a result of the addition of hydrophilic fillers into PVDF matrix, which created larger pores and increased the rate of solvent and non-solvent exchange [7, 49, 52]. Otherwise, the larger pore may reduce the membranes’ ability to reject contaminants [51].

In this study, PMCB0.3 membrane had the lowest rejection of MB, due to its high porosity which allowed MB molecules passed through the membranes (Fig. 6 (b)). Additionally, the rejection value for PMCC0.3 membrane was 85.64%, slightly less than the rejection rate for PMC 0.3, which was 86.50%. All modified PVDF membranes had good rejection values above 80%. PMC0.3 and PMCC 0.3 membranes have high rejection values as a result of the abundance of hydroxyl groups in cellulose and cellulose citrate that form hydrogen bonds with the −NH\(_2\) group of MB [44].

The highest FRR value of 89.27% was obtained for PMCC0.3 membrane (Fig. 6 (c)). The highest hydrophilicity was also found for PMCC0.3 membrane, which increase its anti-fouling characteristics and reduced the hydrophobic contact between surface membrane and MB molecules [49]. All parameter that we tested the highest standard deviation (SD) was obtained for porosity of 4.79 in PMCB0.3 which indicates good homogeneity (SD < 5%). All fillers addition increased PWF, water flux, and FRR significantly (p < 0.05) whereas it is insignificantly increased rejection (p > 0.05) of the PVDF membrane. Rejection and FRR are two parameters that are utilized on a commercial basis to assess membrane performances. Thus, PMCC0.3 was further examined by SEM, ATR-FTIR, and TGA since it had the best performance among PMC0.3 and PMCB0.3 membranes.

The surface and cross-section images of PM, PMC0.3, and PMCC0.3 membranes were shown in Fig. 7. All membranes had the asymmetric membrane characteristics of dense-skin layer, finger-like pore layer, and sponge-like pore layer. All membrane surfaces showed selective dense-skin layers that support membrane rejection [41]. Addition of SPC and SPCC formed longer finger-like structure than PVDF membrane, because hydroxyl groups enhanced the diffusional exchange rate of solvent and non-solvent in phase inversion [41, 43]. The longer finger-like structure confirmed that PMC0.3 and PMCC0.3 have higher PWF and water flux than PM membrane (Fig. 6 (a) and (b)).

The functional group in membrane surfaces was characterized using ATR-FTIR (Fig. 8 (a)). PMC0.3 and PMCC0.3 membranes have similar peaks to PM membrane. PVDF characteristic peaks are obtained in two vibrations. Vibrations of C-H symmetrical and asymmetric groups are shown at 3021 and 2980 cm\(^{-1}\). Vibration of C-F group is shown at 1401, 1176, 1070 cm\(^{-1}\) [6]. Both peaks decreased the absorbance which indicated that cellulose and cellulose citrate successfully blended with PVDF and improve surface hydrophilicity of membrane. Cellulose and cellulose citrate absorption peaks of PMC0.3 and PMCC0.3 membranes have similar peaks to PM membrane. PVDF characteristic peaks are obtained in two vibrations. Vibrations of C-H symmetrical and asymmetric groups are shown at 3021 and 2980 cm\(^{-1}\). Vibration of C-F group is shown at 1401, 1176, 1070 cm\(^{-1}\) [6]. Both peaks decreased the absorbance which indicated that cellulose and cellulose citrate successfully blended with PVDF and improve surface hydrophilicity of membrane. Cellulose and cellulose citrate absorption peaks of PMC0.3 and PMCC0.3 membranes have similar peaks to PM membrane. PVDF characteristic peaks are obtained in two vibrations. Vibrations of C-H symmetrical and asymmetric groups are shown at 3021 and 2980 cm\(^{-1}\). Vibration of C-F group is shown at 1401, 1176, 1070 cm\(^{-1}\) [6]. Both peaks decreased the absorbance which indicated that cellulose and cellulose citrate successfully blended with PVDF and improve surface hydrophilicity of membrane. Cellulose and cellulose citrate absorption peaks of PMC0.3 and PMCC0.3 membranes have similar peaks to PM membrane. PVDF characteristic peaks are obtained in two vibrations. Vibrations of C-H symmetrical and asymmetric groups are shown at 3021 and 2980 cm\(^{-1}\). Vibration of C-F group is shown at 1401, 1176, 1070 cm\(^{-1}\) [6]. Both peaks decreased the absorbance which indicated that cellulose and cellulose citrate successfully blended with PVDF and improve surface hydrophilicity of membrane.
PVDF polymer matrix degradation of PM, PMC0.3, and PMCC0.3 started at 440, 410, and 440 °C, respectively. All membrane had the similar temperature in second step degradation and last degradation at 510 °C and 620 °C, respectively. Thus, thermal stability of PVDF membranes was not significantly impacted by cellulose or cellulose citrate addition.

Rejection and FRR values of PMC0.3 and PMCC0.3 membranes were summarized in Table 2. In this study, the performance of PMC0.3 and PMCC0.3 membranes were better than PM membrane, while PMCB0.3 was comparable with PM membrane. Even at very low filler content in PVDF polymer could improve the membrane properties and performance [55]. In the same filtration method, PMC0.3, PMCB0.3, and PMCC0.3 have a better rejection of dye than modified PVDF membrane with GO/LiCl [4], Cu$_2$S nanoparticles [52], and Fe$_3$O$_4$@XG [1], also comparable with PVDF/-CD-HNTs [56]. This research revealed that cellulose, cellulose benzoate, and cellulose citrate screw pine leaves can be used as fillers for PVDF membrane which gave a comparable membrane performance with inorganic filler.
4 Conclusion

Cellulose benzoate and citrate were successfully synthesized from cellulose of screw pine (*Pandanus tectorius*) leaves by non-Fischer methods, which were confirmed by FT-IR spectra and thermogram TGA. Cellulose, cellulose benzoate, and cellulose citrate were used as fillers of PVDF membrane that was fabricated by blending-phase inversion method. Addition of 0.3% w/w cellulose and cellulose citrate into PVDF membrane improved hydrophilicity and membrane performance, such as water permeability, rejection, and anti-fouling properties. PVDF membrane has water flux value of 11.22 L m$^{-2}$ h$^{-1}$, rejection value of 82.89%, and anti-fouling performance value of 80.26%. Addition of 0.35 w/w cellulose increased PVDF membrane water flux value to 17.63 L m$^{-2}$ h$^{-1}$ and rejection value to 86.50%, while decreased anti-fouling performance value to 74.96%. Addition 0.3% w/w of cellulose citrate increased all PVDF membrane performance, such as water flux value to 37.97%, rejection value to 85.64%, and anti-fouling properties to 89.27%. SEM images of PVDF modified with cellulose and cellulose citrate gave longer finger-like structure and smooth selective layer that improve the membrane performance. Generally, addition of 0.3% w/w cellulose and cellulose citrate into PVDF matrix improves the membrane performances. Cellulose addition increased all parameters significantly ($p < 0.05$), except for the porosity data, which increased insignificantly ($p > 0.05$). The addition of SPC0.3, SPCB0.3, and SPCC0.3 to PVDF membrane greatly improved all parameters ($p < 0.05$), although the only rejection data was insignificant ($p > 0.05$). Thus, the addition of SPC, SPCB, and SPCC should be performed to improve the characteristics and performance of PVDF membrane.
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Table 2 The comparison study of rejection and FRR of MPC0.3 and MPCC0.3 with other studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Filtration membrane</th>
<th>Filtration method</th>
<th>Feed</th>
<th>Rejection (%)</th>
<th>FRR (%)</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PVDF</td>
<td>Dead-end</td>
<td>Methylene blue</td>
<td>82.89</td>
<td>80.26</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMC0.3</td>
<td>Dead-end</td>
<td>Methylene blue</td>
<td>86.50</td>
<td>74.46</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMC80.3</td>
<td>Dead-end</td>
<td>Methylene blue</td>
<td>82.83</td>
<td>73.49</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMCC0.3</td>
<td>Dead-end</td>
<td>Methylene blue</td>
<td>85.64</td>
<td>89.27</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVDF/GO/LiCl</td>
<td>Dead-end</td>
<td>Rhodamine B</td>
<td>67.80</td>
<td>78.20</td>
<td>[4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVDF/CD-HNTs</td>
<td>Dead-end</td>
<td>Direct red 28</td>
<td>88.10</td>
<td>88.30</td>
<td>[56]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVDF/Cu$_2$S nanoparticles</td>
<td>Dead-end</td>
<td>Direct yellow 21</td>
<td>64.70</td>
<td>92.00</td>
<td>[52]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVDF/Fe$_3$O$_4$@XG</td>
<td>Dead-end</td>
<td>Reactive red 120</td>
<td>−75.00</td>
<td>66.50</td>
<td>[1]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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